



APRIL, 1957

No. 99 Vol. IV

NINETY NINE

THE LIBRARY OF
APR 18 1957

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
FAITH
AND
UNITY

CONTENTS

Editorial	2
Apostolic Succession Canon E. W. Kemp	3
The Liturgy and Prayer for Unity Dom Benedict Ley, O.S.B.	8
The Catholic Approach to Reunion The Revd. Michael Bruce	12
The Value of Episcopacy The Revd. Harold Riley	18
Book Review: Master Ridley	21
The Church Assembly and Church Relations	22

THE JOURNAL OF
THE CHURCH UNION COMMITTEE FOR THE DEFENCE OF CHURCH PRINCIPLES
in co-operation with the
JOINT COMMITTEE ON DOCTRINE OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH UNION AND
THE CLERICAL UNION

EDITORIAL

As announced in the last number of *Faith and Unity*, this is the first number under a new editorship. The new editor may therefore be allowed to say that he hopes that readers will, as occasion arises, let him know when there are particular matters they would like to see dealt with, and suggestions that they would like to make.

The report of Father Michael Bruce's speech at the last C.D.C.P. Conference at Oxford was held over, on account of pressure on space, from the last issue. It is now being included, with some necessary abridgement.

Dom Benedict Ley's Conference was delivered to nuns in two of the Communities; but it is felt that allowance can easily be made for this fact by other readers, so that it becomes relevant to their own circumstances.

The publication of some of the details of the programme for the 1958 Lambeth Conference reminds us of the comparative nearness of this gathering. The question of reunion is inevitably in the forefront of its business each time that it re-gathers. On this occasion it will have before it the North India and the Ceylon Schemes of Reunion, and may also expect some indication of the progress of Anglican-Methodist Conversations in England.

Since the last Lambeth Conference, we have seen the Provinces of the Anglican Communion making different decisions towards the Church of South India. As the area covered by reunion schemes goes, it is important that there shall be a full consideration of the reasons for the caution shown in Provinces outside England, and that the whole Anglican Communion should be developing a common mind in this field. The major task of Lambeth 1958 will be to help in this.

The Week of Prayer for Unity seems this year to have become much more firmly established than ever before. For this, there is every reason for thanksgiving. There are of course some risks, since there are those who are naturally tempted to use it for the encouragement of particular plans: but so long as the emphasis put on it by the Abbé Couturier is maintained, nothing but good can come from its widening observance.

We understand that before long there will be available a report on the Conversations which have taken place between representatives of the Church of England and the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. This will be reviewed in *Faith and Unity* as soon as possible after it becomes available.

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

In relation to mankind as a whole the Church militant is a mediator. It is the means appointed by God to teach the truth about him to the world, and to bring men back into union with him. So far as we can see, God's method, almost from the dawn of history, has been to work by selection, to choose certain people, quite regardless of their merits and personal qualifications, to act for him. The Christian Church in this respect has inherited the mission of Israel. Its task is to preach reconciliation to men, and to lead them in the worship of the one true God, to fulfil the prophecy of Isaiah:

And it shall come to pass in the latter days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many peoples shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we shall walk in his paths (3.2-3).

Within the Church there are various individuals and groups who from time to time exercise something of the same function of mediation towards the generality of Christians. As in the old Israel the Rechabites and the prophets, so in the new Israel the religious communities, teachers, evangelists, healers, have been raised up by God to perform particular functions, or to keep before the Church some part of the Christian way which was in danger of being lost or forgotten.

As well as these particular vocations, however, God from the first established what we call the Ministry in a narrower sense to be mediators to the whole Church on earth, just as that Church itself is a mediator to mankind. Christ is priest, prophet and king, and the whole Church as his Body exercises those offices in the world (cf. I Peter 2, 5 and 9). The Ministry, in a particular way, exercises them within the Church. Its duty is to rule, to serve, to speak in God's name in preaching and teaching, to offer the Church's sacrifice to God. In course of time some of these functions were assigned to certain classes of minister, but it is more convenient for the present to speak of the Ministry as one.

The Ministry was placed by God within the Church to be part of the Church. It was not created by the Church, and does not derive its authority simply and solely from the Church. The Apostles formed the nucleus of the first Christian community, and Christians of the second century as well as of the latter part of the first looked upon the Ministry in the Church of their time as having a commission derived ultimately from that given by our Lord to the Apostles. A Christian community which had

not a Ministry possessed of that commission would not have been regarded as a constituent part of the Church as that word was understood in the first fifteen centuries of the Christian era. That is not however to say that the possession of such a Ministry alone would make such a body a part of the Church, and indeed the limits of the Church were scarcely more easy to draw then than they are now, as St. Augustine found.

As the Church grew and spread throughout the world, one aspect of the Ministry acquired greater prominence than it had had before, namely that of a link between the different Christian communities. The relations between the Ministry of each local church with those of other local churches became of great importance in maintaining the unity of the whole Body, and in enabling the Church as a whole to meet the various crises which occurred. They also contributed to the maintenance of unity in faith and discipline. It was important that each local church should possess a Ministry which was recognised by the other parts of Christendom as sharing equally in the apostolic commission which they themselves held, and it does not appear to have been recognised to be the right of individual groups of Christians to set up a Ministry for themselves and without its being related to the Ministry of the whole Church. This leads directly to the question—What is meant by apostolic succession?

The Meaning of the Succession

It is now a commonplace of early Church history that in the second century Christian theologians faced by the disruptive claims of the Gnostic sects became aware of their possession of three lines of defence: the Apostolic Creed, the Apostolic Scripture, and the Apostolic Succession. If we were considering the apostolicity of the Church we should have to look at all three of these, but for the purpose of this paper the third alone requires examination. In the appeal to the apostolic succession as it is found in such writers as Irenaeus the following elements seem to be present.

(1) *Publicity.* By contrast with the Gnostic claim to a secret tradition the Catholics appealed to a succession which admits of verification by every man as having been all along an open and evident part of the history of the Christian community.

(2) *Connexion with the apostles as a guarantee of authentic teaching.* The appeal takes the form of a construction of lists of bishops of particular sees, in which, starting from the apostolic founders of each see, the succession of the bishops in it is traced down to the time of writing. Thus of Rome, St. Irenaeus says: "The blessed apostles having founded and built up the church put into the hands of Linus the ministry of the episcopate

... His successor was Anencletus; after him in the third place from the apostles Clement is allotted the episcopate", and so on until "Soter succeeded Anicetus, and now, in the twelfth place from the apostles, Eleutherius is the actual occupant of the see".

(3) *The possession of a commission.* The apostles are regarded as having given to those whom they appointed as the first ministers of the churches which they founded a commission which they had themselves received from the Lord, and which he had received from the Father. This is made clear by Clement of Rome, and is implicit in certain of the Epistles of Ignatius. The authority exercised by the holders of this commission is not derived from the Church, but they themselves are chosen by the Church to hold it.

(4) *A link between churches.* C. H. Turner writes: "The appeal in its fullest scope was never to a single line of succession only. Behind even the greatest and most illustrious of these lines there lay in reserve that which gave its strength to each, the consent of all It was not one line of descent, but many, which linked the Church of Irenaeus and Tertullian with the Church of the Apostles; in brief it was not the Apostolic Succession, but the Apostolic Successions, which made the ultimate guarantee of the security of the deposit". The Ministry which the ministers of the various churches held was one, the one apostolic commission. By sharing in that commission they formed the visible bond between their church and other churches, and the agreement of the ministers of the different churches was a powerful guarantee of the truth of the teaching which they gave. If any minister taught in contradiction to that which was agreed he would be repudiated by the ministers of the other churches, and if his own church continued to support him it would be cut off from the whole Christian fellowship. It is doubtful whether in the early centuries any such minister would ever have been allowed to resume his functions.

In the course of the first five centuries this complex aspect of the Apostolic Succession became clarified into a two-fold distinction of order and jurisdiction, a distinction worked out under the pressure of events and above all established by St. Augustine. The distinction was drawn between a man's possession of a charisma or ministerial character by virtue of being ordained by a person or persons who themselves could trace back their own appointment to one of the apostles, and the authority given by the Church to exercise this ministry. Thus the Donatist clergy who had gone into schism were not allowed to minister by an act of ecclesiastical authority. Although it is always difficult to

be quite sure what is the teaching of the Eastern Church, the statements made by the Ecumenical Patriarch and certain other Eastern authorities on the subject of Anglican Orders indicate that Eastern theology has developed along lines similar to the West in this respect and that the distinction can claim the authority of ecumenical agreement. It is less strict than what appears to have been the practice of the early Church, but forced upon the Church as a whole by the pressure of events. The weakness of it is that it may suggest that the Ministry exists apart from the Church, and, as C. H. Turner says, "lend colour to a mechanical conception of the Sacraments"; and yet it is difficult to see how it can be avoided. Most Anglican theologians would strongly repudiate the suggestion that a Roman Catholic priest who joined the Church of England ought to be re-ordained. They would equally repudiate the suggestion that he could exercise his priesthood in the Church of England without receiving the authority of the Church to do so.

The Succession and Reunion

It may be wondered how far this distinction can be of service in assisting relations between a body which possesses a ministry standing in the unbroken continuity of apostolic succession as outlined above, and one possessing a ministry which does not so stand. Of the various schemes put forward, that proposed at present in North India seems the worst, because it ignores the differences and the proposed common formula of commissioning, drawn up in such terms that it can be applied to both ministries without distinction, will, if put into effect, give rise to grave doubts about the validity of the orders of some of the ministers of the united North Indian Church. The South Indian method is rather better but it too has its defects. The existence for the time being of presbyters of the C.S.I. who do not stand in the apostolic succession restricts considerably the relations which one of the parent bodies is able to have with it. Further this acceptance of such presbyters for the time being as on an equality with those who do stand in the succession is defended inside and outside the C.S.I. on the grounds that it is a temporary anomaly. Throughout its history the Church has tolerated anomalies for the sake of charity and a greater good, but it is obvious that if a number of reunion schemes similar to the South Indian one were to come into being, the exception would almost have superseded the rule.

Episcopacy

In this paper I have so far said nothing about episcopacy, and that is because it seems desirable to emphasise that apostolic succession and the growth of moniscopacy are two distinct

things. As Dr. Darwell Stone has written, "An episcopal succession in which there was a body of presbyters who had received the episcopal powers and authority, who for a time shared in the act of ordaining which was later restricted to the one monarchical bishop, would be, so far as the point of the maintenance of the succession is concerned, the same in principle as the rule of a single bishop". Having said this, however, I should add Dr. Stone's complementary remarks: "Whatever may be true as to particular details at certain times, the general Christian consciousness, the mind of the Church, settled down to the requirement of episcopal succession, and in the form of monepiscopacy. The maxim of St. Ignatius, 'Let that be held a valid Eucharist which is under the bishop or one to whom he shall have committed it', is found to be the settled judgement of the Universal Church".

The Report of the Doctrinal Commission points out that historically the combined principles of oversight and continuity have been associated with the institution known as the Episcopate. The Report goes on to list five considerations upon the union of which it says "the very nature of the office depends". They are as follows:

- (1) The Episcopate symbolises and secures in an abiding form the apostolic mission and authority within the Church.
- (2) It has remained a function of the Episcopate to guard the Church against erroneous teaching.
- (3) The Bishop in his official capacity represents the whole Church in and to his diocese, and his diocese in and to the Councils of the Church. He is thus a living representative of the unity and universality of the Church.
- (4) The Bishop in his diocese represents the Good Shepherd. Both clergy and laity look to him as Chief Pastor, and he represents in a special degree the paternal quality of pastoral care.
- (5) The Bishop as the proper organ of unity and universality is the appropriate agent for carrying on through ordination the authority of the apostolic mission of the Church.

The Report observes that it is the coalescence of all these elements in a single person that gives to the Episcopate its peculiar importance. Such coalescence could not effectively take place in a committee or assembly. And the full development of these several elements will prevent the undue development of any. It may be added that for the proper development of these various elements some permanence is also needed.

E. W. KEMP.

THE LITURGY AND PRAYER FOR UNITY

*A Conference given at Burford Priory and Burnham Abbey,
January 1957*

"Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God". (Hebrews 12.2).

These words could be used as an accurate description of your life as enclosed contemplative Religious. For your life is one aimed continually at God, directed wholly to him. It is then a life of attention to Jesus, and so to his great redemptive acts. You look always at his reconciliation of men with God, and in him with one another. You do this precisely because the Religious Life is for you the fullest and most effective response you can make to his life-giving Passion. Indeed your contemplative life is for you your great reception of the saving act of Christ. "It could be said", writes Père Bouyer in his Book "Life and Liturgy", "that mystical experience is simply a full realisation in ourselves of the Christian mystery—Christ's redemptive act—as communicated to us through the Sacraments, especially the Eucharist. But we must also say, no less emphatically, that the objective gift of grace conferred by the Sacraments was anciently understood to lead us by its very nature towards that subjective apprehension. The life-giving Passion of Christ was understood to be present in the Sacraments as calling for, inspiring and creating in us obedient and loving faith. And it was in so far as the Passion of Christ, made present through the Sacraments, was met by our effective and real acceptance of the Passion in our actual lives, that the mystical experience was in preparation as the final recognition of our identification, achieved by way of the Sacraments, with the risen Christ".

From this quotation you will see at once that there is no subjective or personal piety which does not come from your apprehension of the mystery as offered to your faith in the Sacrament; nor can there be any extension of the mystery to you or in your lives, which does not require your being ever more ready to receive its living substance. So there can never be any real opposition between liturgical and private prayer. Both these kinds of prayer are intimately joined and bound together in any true living of the Christian life. Both have their part in prayer for unity, as I hope to show you.

Now your life here is a life of attention to and response to our Lord's great redemptive act; and so to his self-oblation, his prayer for the visible unity of all Christians. You can make no corporate or individual prayer for unity without giving his prayer *ut omnes unum sint* its effective expression and manifesta-

tion in your daily life. As you know it is your life itself, in so far as it is God-centred, which is the very essence or substance of your prayer. Your fundamental attitude towards God is the very core of your prayer. Your daily life, then, is the way or the means in which Christ's prayer for unity is to be, as it were, incarnated and expressed effectively in you. So any wilful concern with self, all deliberate fussing about what happens or might happen to you, all idle amusement of your vanity and pride by foolish day dreaming or silly comparing of yourself with others, especially with the treatment given them by authority and the same authority's neglect of your existence—all such thinking is a failure in prayer, in looking unto Jesus. For while you indulge knowingly such thoughts, you are only looking at yourself, failing to pray. True, you may appear outwardly to do all the sort of things nuns are supposed to do. But you only look at the Saviour and his great redemptive act as you try, quietly but firmly, to drop, in the power of his passing over from death to life, all self-concern, and to resist that self-regarding tendency so rooted in our fallen human nature that it even invades our prayer. For there are people who pay more attention to the prayer *they* are making than to him to whom they pray.

Prayer and Life

Now this attentiveness to God, this close adhesion to him is the very essence of the prayer of faith, or of pure prayer as St. Benedict calls it. That is a prayer without images or mental pictures. Such pure prayer must be continually improved, deepened and sustained in its vitality by the real acceptance of the Cross in your daily life. You see, to pray is to give yourself over to God, pass over into him. And to share in the Passion of Christ, as your Religious vows oblige you to do, is to plunge daily further into his *transitus*, his passing over, as your Head, from death to life, through the Cross to the Resurrection. Always remember then, that every cross offered for your acceptance is a real opportunity to strengthen your prayer, as individuals and as a community. For what we recall, here and now before God in every Mass is not only our Lord's suffering and death, but his Resurrection and Ascension, his sacrifice and its acceptance, his great Passover from death to life. So in every Mass you proclaim and plead his triumphant, utterly successful, prayer for unity. And this means that to refuse to live out the Mass by the actual acceptance of life's daily trials and crosses is to refuse to let Christ's prayer for unity re-echo in your life, and sound like some lovely music in your heart.

I use the adjective actual deliberately, because it is very easy for any of us to suppose we are fervent pray-ers for unity and really do effect something for the ending of the scandal of our divisions, whereas, in fact, we are nothing and do nothing of the

kind. True, we wish to pray and to work for unity, since we know we could hardly be called Christians if we did not. But we do not always go beyond this wish, because we do not accept wholeheartedly, without deliberate murmuring, our share in the Passion of Christ. Surely it will be by all Christians everywhere filling up that which is lacking of the sufferings of Christ in his Body the Church that the immense good of unity will be granted to them. The best and truest work anyone can do for unity is that of complete submission to the Lord's will in all things, especially in the crosses that come to him. You see, it is one thing to go to Mass and receive Holy Communion, participate fully in the Christian mystery there recalled before God, and it is quite another thing to live out the Mass in all the details of everyday life. And this, not merely by outwardly conforming to the Community's time-table and customs—as you must do to be physically stable in the Community—but by interiorly giving yourself over to God in the power of Christ's Passover in all the obediences and sacrifices authority or the common life demand from you or of you.

Sanctification

You beg, in the Lyon intentions for the Week of Prayer, for the sanctification of other Christian bodies, because ultimately the problem of unity or reunion is a matter of the spiritual life. But you can only make these petitions sincerely in so far as you see their very existence as a direct personal call from God to you to sanctify yourself. "For their sakes I sanctify myself". Now, as you know, God alone knows what steps you must take here and now to advance in sanctity—in the sanctity of Christ, and so become 'another Christ'. No amount of anxious or fearful self-scrutiny and fuss will increase Christ's prayer for unity in you by revealing the means of deeper unity with it. Such an interior session or committee meeting will get you nowhere. Rather it will end in mist and fog, and you will see nothing clearer. But proper attention to God's present will for you, shown in the real opportunities for patience, self-abasement, self-donation, that others give you, will make quite plain your forward way to sanctity, the way you must take to enter more deeply into our Lord's great passing over through the Cross to the Resurrection, into his triumphant prayer for unity. Do remember that his prayer has succeeded, that it is being ever heard. You have to let its triumph be manifested in your lives and hearts, not by some startling act of yours, but by the genial acceptance of your share in his Cross in homely everyday ways, and in the living of the common life.

Our Lord endured the Cross, despising the shame for the joy that was set before him. Now the special joy set before those who pray for unity, is the joy of knowing that what they ask for will

be granted. For daily, yearly, the fervour and number of those who pray for this great grace increases. Indeed unity would surely be at our door waiting for us, if we were all better Christians and really accepted our share in the Saviour's Cross, making light of its shame! But what a fuss we make if we do receive a quite legitimate and proper rebuke! How disturbed we become if others criticise us or fail to share in our imaginary ideas as to our own worth and talents! How upset some Anglicans become if Roman Catholics seem to look down on them, or are arrogant in their contacts with them—or *vice versa*! Surely the extent to which we respond to the objective presentation of the Christian Mystery to us will be shown in our reacting more and more like Christ in all the humiliations and shame we encounter. We must despise, make light of, the shame, by using it, as we must use all things, pleasant or painful, as a means or opportunity of greater ascension to God, greater union with the great Passover of Christ. I said at the beginning that your life here in all its aspects is the essence of your prayer for unity; for it is your God-given, divinely appointed, way of response to the Christian Mystery and its extension to you in the Mass and Sacraments. And since it is the way in which Christ's own prayer for unity is to be expressed in your life, your fidelity in the self-oblation it demands of you is your present witness to its triumph.

The Example of Polycarp

Perhaps you will recall the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, about 150 A.D., at the age of 84. The executioners tied him, but did not nail him to the pyre on which he was to be burnt. For he said, "Leave me as I am. He who grants me to endure the fire will enable me to remain on the pyre unmoved, without the security you desire from the nails". You are tied to your pyre here by your vows. And you know that he who allows you to undergo here the fire of his passion will enable you to remain stable in this place of sacrifice, to be an abiding prayer for unity. When St. Polycarp had been bound, he made a sort of Eucharistic Prayer. "Lord God almighty", he said, "Father of thy beloved and blessed Servant Jesus Christ, the God of Angels and powers and of all creation, and of the whole race of the righteous who live in thy presence: I bless thee, because thou hast deemed me worthy of this day and hour, to take my part in the number of the Martyrs, in the cup of Christ for resurrection to eternal life of soul and body in the immortality of the Holy Spirit; among whom may I be received in thy presence this day as a rich and acceptable sacrifice . . . For this and everything I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee through the eternal and heavenly High Priest Jesus Christ . . . through whom be glory to thee with him and Holy Spirit, both now and unto the ages to come. Amen".

What a good prayer for you to say in gratitude for your vocation, for your call to be an acceptable offering in Christ to God for unity. Père Bouyer tells us in the book quoted above that "virginity for the sake of the Kingdom of God was thought of in the early Church as a kind of life-long martyrdom, since it implied a complete renunciation of the natural fruitfulness of human life, to devote oneself more competely to the coming Kingdom". And he says also that "from the fourth century the monk began to take the place of the martyr as accomplishing in his own way a freely accepted martyrdom, especially in view of the mystical character of such a vocation". But to be a true martyr, a true witness to the great passing over of Christ through death to life, you must be stable in enduring the Cross and despising the shame. And then, please God, you will begin to appear to others as St. Polycarp appeared to those who saw his martyrdom. In their account of it, they wrote: "He was in the midst of the fire not as burning flesh but as baking bread, or as gold and silver refined in a furnace. And we perceived such a sweet aroma as the breath of incense or some other spice". To be truly the wheat of God, a baking bread, a sacrifice that breathes out fragrance (Phil. 4.19), a pure offering for unity, a witness to its certain coming, you must heed God's word to you now. You must be ever looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the Cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of God.

BENEDICT LEY, O.S.B.

THE CATHOLIC APPROACH TO REUNION

*A speech delivered at the C.D.C.P. Conference at Oxford,
in September 1956
(Abridged)*

For the past few years, although Catholics have in a quiet way been working for the reunion of Christendom, the initiative has appeared to lie with Liberal Protestants; they have produced schemes of reunion, and we have had to spend a great deal of time and energy in saying where these were wrong or unacceptable.

The strain of fighting for Catholic principles for the past fifteen years has been such that had the passing of the Convocations' resolutions been accepted with as little fuss as the far more questionable ones of 1950 were, we might well have breathed a sigh of relief, and rested on our laurels. That emphatically is not what the present situation calls for. But before going into what it does call for, it is essential to put it into its historical context.

Speaking at a C.D.C.P. meeting in 1944, I said: "Suppose the majority of the Church of England is committed on some point to a violation of Catholic Faith or Order—what happens then?" After maintaining that "being in communion is . . . ultimately a diocesan matter", and that we should therefore have to ask our bishops individually where they stood, and put ourselves under the nearest orthodox bishop if our own bishop was compromised, I went on: "I think that many, young men especially, are going over to Rome, or becoming terribly unsettled, because they do not know precisely where the Rubicon lies; and they are uncertain whether their leaders will stand firm if it is crossed. I think myself that it is high time that we should know precisely what steps are needed; that we should be utterly clear as to the correctness of our procedure, and be able to assure people that they have no need of qualms about remaining in the Church of England. We need to assure them that unless and until their leaders act, no action by them is necessary. We need to assure them that we are not shilly-shallying, but are fully aware of the situation we face, and prepared to meet it; that we shall not allow our position as Catholics to be compromised, but will sever ourselves from heresy and schism if and when they are formally accepted; but that, on the other hand, we will not take the final step until the last possible moment consistent with obedience to Catholic faith and discipline." That was twelve years ago.

Speaking for myself, it was because that issue was frankly faced, that I was able to survive the long years during which the threat that schism might rend the Church of England was a grim reality. Having faced that situation imaginatively, to have resolved to stand firm without compromise was an immense relief from inner tension and a source of strength, though it left one with a pain of heart which it was not always easy to turn into prayer.

A second fruit of facing this issue of schism was a great precision in thinking about what the doctrinal issues were. The woolly-minded are apt to compromise principles in an effort to be charitable, or else to fail to be as charitable as they might be, lest they compromise some principle they do not fully understand. We were delivered from either danger by having grasped the nettle. This, I think, explains why those who were in the thick of the fray in the years when the battle over South India was at its hottest accepted the Convocations' decisions; while it was new people, who had not lived face to face with the issues raised by South India for so long, who were worried.

Once more we need to make it clear that one point in the Catholic attitude to reunion is this old one of unswerving allegiance to principle, and a complete repudiation of compromise. But that is only a first step. When the dust has settled, it will be realised that those who since 1944 (and before) fought

unceasingly against the dangers with which "South Indianism" threatened the Anglican Communion, neither deserted their principles nor compromised them in 1955. But similar dangers still remain over North India, Ceylon and other schemes, and we shall need to maintain the same precision as to the issues raised, and the same loyalty to Catholic principles.

A New Situation

Yet when all that has been duly noted, it remains true that there is today a new situation. There remains the duty of dealing with inadequate reunion schemes; but the main emphasis has shifted, for it has become increasingly clear, even to their supporters, that none of these schemes is going to lead to the reunion of Christendom. There are some, no doubt, who are quite content that they should not—people who only want a pan-Protestant reunion. But we wrong the vast majority of those who have been enthusiasts for these schemes if we imagine that that was all they wanted. Most of them genuinely wanted the reunion of *Christendom*. They were naive enough to think that their Liberal-Protestant methods would in the end lead to this result. Their attitude of mind was a hangover from the philosophy of inevitable progress.

Many of course still pursue the same policies; but increasingly they do so because they do not see any alternative method of working for reunion; but they have lost their pristine confidence that their methods will produce the result they want.

In this new mood, in which many have lost confidence in the ultimate success of the methods they are pursuing, they are more ready to respond to a new lead, a lead which we Catholics can give theologically.

Preparation for a Catholic Lead

But before we can give that lead which will be understood and listened to, we need to prepare the ground spiritually. The truism that we need to live the Faith before we can impart it is particularly true in relation to work for reunion.

The brotherhood of man is meant to be a brotherhood as real and close as that of a nation at war, of Islam, the Communist party, or the Bruderbund; but a brotherhood which draws men together rather than separates them. Yet man is incapable of such brotherhood if it is not united by opposition, unless the uniting force is the Spirit of God himself.

This spirit of opposition can and does find its way into the realisations of Christians to one another, and even into reunion discussions, but the Body of Christ remains the one brotherhood which depends for its cohesion not on opposition to other groups, but on the infinitely greater power of an unadulterated love, love not just conceived as a human attribute, but that true and

essential love which is of the nature of the Godhead, which lies at the root of the doctrine of the Trinity, and is ours by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in his Church. It is for this reason that work for Christian unity can never be a purely intellectual theological exercise. For the truth of God must be spiritually as well as intellectually discerned. The intellectual work that is needed in the search for mutual understanding between separated Christians in the one truth will lose none of its edge, or need for complete frankness and logical integrity if this is realised, but it will be seen to be wholly impossible and merely divisive without prayer.

We need to pray, however, not merely for the reunion of Christendom, thought of in terms of joining together the separated bodies of Christians, but for that unity of mankind for which it was originally created, and which is only restored in him who is the New Adam. The Catholic approach to unity is rooted and grounded in holiness. There are several basic points to remember:—

(1) All liturgical prayer is a participation in Christ's priestly offering. Our blessed Lord said: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." The fact that Christians are divided and that many have forsaken the God-given form of the Church must never be allowed to obscure the fact that the Church is in a sense present whenever two or three are gathered in Christ's name.

(2) Instance after instance can be quoted not only of individual witness, but of corporate loyalty to Christ of bodies outside the full life of the Catholic Church. Such witness under persecution cannot be separated from the living Church.

(3) The statement that all baptized Christians are members of the Church, but that organised bodies outside the ranks of those who hold fast to Apostolic faith and order are not part of the Church is only partially true. Corporate worship and witness is always more than the sum of individual worship and witness: in some sense it is part, however imperfect and incomplete, of that of the whole Church.

Next we need to be clear about the things that divide Christians:—

(1) *Sin*. The pride which makes Catholics look down their noses at Protestants as though Faith and Order were possessions we had earned is no less a cause of division than the pride of Protestants which makes them refuse to accept the fact that they lack anything.

(2) *Honest Disagreement*. Prayer for unity will be worthless and insincere if it takes the form "O God, grant us unity, but don't expect me to do any work". Differences need to be studied, and that means hard intellectual work.

(3) *Differences in the tradition of godly living.* Anglo-Catholics, on the whole seem to appreciate this better than Central Anglicans, who often appear to assume that enthusiastic Baptists should at once appreciate the superiority of Anglican Evensong to a rousing mission service. They don't!

We must all find Jesus where we are, according to our own pattern of godly living, and as we pray for our fellow-Christians, we must pray for the sanctification of Calvinists, Lutherans, Roman Catholics, etc.; for it is only as we are made holy that we shall find unity.

His Holiness the Pope gave a lead in this matter when he called upon those of his communion to respect, understand and love their fellow-Christians, and to remember that the fragments of gold-bearing rock are still gold-bearing.

Praying for unity by praying for our fellow-Christians is not just a matter of adding a collect for unity to the prayers we say already, or even of participating in the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity. It involves our whole attitude to prayer.

Christian prayer is never private. Even our most personal prayers are prayed in Christ. When we pray as Christians we enter into his prayer. We cannot say an Our Father without praying for all those who are God's children by adoption, and even more widely, for all who are his children by creation. Nor can we say an Our Father without praying that all may be gathered into one in Christ. It is through the gathering into one in him that we know God as our Father. The first two words of the Lord's Prayer are already a prayer for unity. We know that it is God's will that all should be saved and that all who believe in Christ should be one, and we pray that God's will may be done on earth as it is in heaven—perfectly.

So too we cannot offer the holy Sacrifice without praying for unity. Apart from the collect for unity, we can remind our fellow-Anglicans of the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church, "that *all* they that do confess thy holy Name may agree in the truth of thy holy word, and live in unity and godly love". But we must go further. Prayer is not just saying prayers, still less just asking. This is particularly true in relation to unity. Prayer involves body, mind, desire, will, the whole personality organised for one objective; therefore it involves the whole of life. It involves the acceptance of suffering and humiliation, and offering them to God, for it is selfishness and pride that divide. There is no break between the interior life of prayer and the exterior life of doing. We are the Body of Christ, and the suffering of the Body continues wherever it meets sin, either in our own lives, or in the world about us. It is only by suffering that evil can be defeated.

The Theological Approach

To state the Catholic approach to reunion in theological terms is, I am convinced, to go back to the scandal of particularity which our fellow-Christians accept in regard to the choice of Abraham, of Israel, of one village in one Roman province at one particular time in history, and above all in the incarnate life of the one Saviour, and to show that it is thus consistent with the whole of God's dealing with men that the same scandal of particularity should be found in the nature and structure of the one Church which is Christ's Body.

If God wills unity, as we all believe, it is ridiculous to believe that he has no plan for it, and to think that what is of the *bene esse* or *plene esse*, because it is part of his plan, can be less than of the *esse*. We can stop arguing whether "churches" are "true churches", or "false churches" because they lack the Apostolic Succession, and get back to what once more all agree in theory, that there is but one Church, and we must all conform to the pattern of it which is in accordance with God's plan, and part of the scandal of particularity.

No one will accept the precious gifts we as Catholics have to offer unless we have not only a true personal humility, but also have exorcised the spirit of group pride, under which the rags of our self-centredness so often shelter long after we have slain the cruder forms of it. No one will accept the treasures we hold in trust for them unless they really feel and know that we love them with the true charity of God. We all know nothing is more speedily or deeply resented than the patronising false charity of the "Lady Bountiful", and we have often made Holy Church look like that. Real love can only grow out of real holiness, real living in Christ.

We have to put forward theologically a unique plan which is in every deed scandalous in its particularity, but we are not going to do so without a recovery of a costly, sacrificial, spiritual life.

Tricks to get men to accept Catholic Orders without quite realising what they are doing can be no real basis for advance. However much we may appreciate the sincere desire for reunion that lay behind the South India Scheme, and however much we recognise that God may bless those who make mistakes if their motives are good, and lead them to a deeper appreciation of truth, the fact remains that in South India they did make a mistake; their methods were wrong, and they still need to be led into a deeper appreciation of the truth.

Our method must be to get men to unite on the basis of Catholic Faith and Order; not by subtle schemes and compromises, but simply because they have learned to see that this is the true basis of unity.

MICHAEL BRUCE

THE VALUE OF EPISCOPACY

The Background

Some of the hesitations in the minds of non-Episcopalians as to the value of episcopacy seem to arise from the not unnatural habit of its adherents of dealing, when the case for episcopacy is being discussed, only with those functions of the episcopate which are exclusive to it and distinguish it from the presbyterate. Discussions therefore often seem to start from the basis of a common, but unrecognised assumption, that the presbyterate is the "normal" ministry of the Church, the bishop being a sort of super-presbyter with added powers and functions, the value of, and justification for which constitute the matter under discussion. We should, on the contrary, I suggest, begin by considering the episcopate as constituting the *norm* of the Christian Ministry, the bishop exercising this in all its fulness, with the presbyterate sharing in its exercise with certain limitations.

On the former assumption, the case for episcopacy is presented as established by those things which distinguish the bishop from the presbyter: the administration and government of the Church, the pastoral oversight of other pastors, the exclusive prerogative of ordaining others, and (with certain qualifications) the administration of the rite of Confirmation. The non-Episcopalian begins in consequence by asking whether such functions may not equally well be exercised in other ways: whether the government of the Church may not be just as well entrusted to a corporate body; whether the oversight of pastors requires the existence of a special order with an indelible character; whether the function of ordaining to the ministry may not be satisfactorily discharged by a representative group of ministers democratically appointed; and whether admission to communicant status demands an episcopal Confirmation.

On the other hand, if we begin with a less partial definition of the bishop's office, taking into account not only those things which distinguish the episcopate from the presbyterate, but also those things which they have in common, the matter may look very different. Starting from the consideration of the bishop's holding the ministerial character in its fulness, we shall see the exclusive functions on the background of the whole meaning of his office, and therefore in their proper light.

The Liturgical President

On this view, we should begin with the recognition of the bishop as the duly appointed president over the Church's life and worship. There is, I think, an illuminating comment in Dix's *Shape of the Liturgy* (p.60). He is speaking of the *chaburah* supper, and writes: 'But the breaking of bread and the saying

of the Thanksgiving over the cup were by Jewish custom performed by the "president" alone, who received certain special privileges in the other parts of the meal in consequence. The president of the meal is indeed referred to more than once* simply as "he who says the Thanksgiving", just as, conversely, the christian Justin in the second century refers to the bishop who "eucharistises" the bread and wine as "the president" (*prokathemenos*) without further description. There is here the germ of a precedence and authority arising out of the liturgical "presidency" of the christian *chaburah* supper which is of quite special importance in the origins of the episcopate, though I am not aware that it has yet been adequately taken into account in the discussions of that much disputed question.

It does not affect the point I am trying to make whether or not one follows Dix in his views on the connection between the *chaburah*-supper and the Christian Eucharist. What is relevant is his insight into the significance of the bishop's position as first of all the president over the liturgy.

It is well to remember that this primitive "presidency" of the bishop did not merely put him in the position of being the "celebrant" of the Eucharist, the person who recited the eucharistic prayer, but also gave him a special *teaching* function. He not only stood at the altar to make the Thanksgiving, he also sat on his throne to expound the Gospel. Numerous references could be given to illustrate this office, in which the bishop was continuing the apostolic function of witness. He might or might not be eloquent; what was required of him, as a steward of the mysteries of the Gospel, was not eloquence, but that he should be found faithful. To this day the Anglican Ordinal, in the rite for the consecration of bishops, sets forth this responsibility.

It is clear enough that already in the early centuries the liturgical presidency of the bishop could when necessary be delegated to a presbyter, so that when it became no longer possible for all the Christians in a town to worship under one roof, different presbyters became "celebrants" of the Eucharist in different churches. Within the local church which we now call a diocese we have for many centuries been accustomed to the common case of a presbyter being the "celebrant" most frequently seen by the mass of the people; but it is still in virtue of sharing in the bishop's pastoral care that the parish priest (the "curate"), or his assistant curate, presides at the Eucharist.

The Bishop and the Diocese

With such a liturgical presidency in mind, we may better evaluate the more exclusive functions of the bishop. With the increase in the size of local churches, from their being small

*Sc. in the *Mishnah* (H.R.)

7

congregations under the bishop's own immediate presidency, apparent at every Eucharist, to their becoming large dioceses with many different places of worship, we have come to associate the administration both of Baptism and of the Eucharist with the local priest. With regard to the former, the bishop's continued oversight is still witnessed to not only by his authority given to the parish priest, (and also, according to the Book of Common Prayer, by applications for adult Baptism being referred to him), but in particular by his special connection with Confirmation as a further stage in Christian initiation. This finds somewhat different expression in different parts of the Church: in the East it has come to be through presbyters confirming with the use of chrism which the bishop has blessed; in the Roman Catholic Church it is normally by the bishop's own action in confirming, but on occasion by delegation to a priest to act for him, in which case also the priest anoints with chrism blessed by the bishop, as in the East; in the Anglican Churches it is by the laying on of the bishop's own hand. In all these cases, it is still the bishop who maintains a particular relationship to the admission of new members of the Church, and especially in its final stage, on which admission to communicant-status depends.

As regards administration and government, the bishop remains as the president over the local church, holding a position parallel to that which he has in its worship. This presidency calls for some concurrence from the clergy (and indeed from the laity also), and even in times of the greatest abuse, when bishops have sometimes appeared to be the spiritual counterparts of great secular lords, it is probably easy to under-estimate the force of the influence of the rest of the Church on the bishop. A "president" is more than a chairman, but it is right that he should profit by the advice, and seek the support, of others. This works out in many incidental ways, but has also some definite canonical expressions, as in the working of the English Convocations, where the concurrence of the Lower House is required for Acts of Convocation, and in the institution of diocesan synods.

The Bishop and the Presbyterate

The responsibility for being a *pastor pastorum* is also inherent in the very nature of the relationship of the bishop to the Christian family whose "father in God" he is. That he has delegated some of his authority to others implies that he cannot be indifferent either to the way in which they exercise it, or to the persons of those to whom he has done so. The appointment of "Superintendent presbyters" chosen to help their brother presbyters creates a different, and I submit, a less valuable, relationship than that which arises naturally in an episcopal Church, where there is an inherent father-son relationship between the bishop and all his flock.

The function of the bishop in ordaining seems to be completely consonant with this. When he ordains presbyters, he does so with other presbyters associating themselves with his action; an illustration of the concurrence of the presbyterate with his presidency. As the celebration of the Eucharist is a *sacramental* function, it is a proper corollary that the delegation of the authority to perform it must be by a *sacramental* act—the act of ordination by the bishop—and not by a mere “legal” form of commission.

As regards the consecration of bishops, the question whether or not there was ever a time when the Church committed this function to the corporate presbyterate in a particular church is now only of historical interest. If it did, it was to the *corporate* presbyterate, a very different thing from ordination by individual presbyters; but the wisdom of the Church, surely guided by the Holy Spirit, has at least since very remote times limited the function of consecrating bishops to those who themselves belong to the same order. As the bishop is not only the representative of his diocese in the wider councils of the Church, but also the representative of the whole Church to his diocese, the practice suitably signifies the approval of the Church as a whole on the acceptance of a particular person in the diocese. The bishop is the centre of unity within his diocese, and a vital link, through his communion with other bishops, between his diocese and the other local (diocesan) churches.

HAROLD RILEY

BOOK REVIEW

MASTER RIDLEY

NICHOLAS RIDLEY. By Jasper Godwin Ridley (*Longmans Green and Co.* 25s. 452 pp.)

Nicholas Ridley was born in the feudal Northumberland of the immediate pre-Reformation period. He was of a scholarly cast of mind that was not likely to find its future in the contemporary rough-and-tumble of the border counties, and Cambridge became his second, and his real home. In quieter times such a man might well have spent the rest of his life there, immersed in bookish and scholarly pursuits, but the first stirrings of future religious troubles had already begun, and the King's Matter soon opened the flood-gates. Even then Ridley might have contrived to remain outside the chief storm-centres of the coming controversies, but in 1537, having by then come to a theological position akin to Cranmer's own, he took what was to prove the momentous step of becoming chaplain to the Archbishop. From

that point his own theological development and the course of political events carried him remorselessly onward to his tragic death at the stake in Oxford.

It was that end that has indelibly impressed his memory on the minds of English people. It is difficult indeed to think oneself back into the world where such deaths were tolerated and approved by public, and indeed by Christian opinion. The treatment of the matter in the present biography is conspicuously fair. "The Protestant leaders," writes the author in speaking of Anabaptism, "were determined to stamp it out; and we may be certain that Cranmer and Ridley were ready to send any number of unrepentant Anabaptists to the stake. If, in fact, they only burned two, this was simply because they could not lay hands on any more." An assumption that heresy must be exterminated, even at the cost of inflicting the most cruel of deaths, was part of the mental outlook of the time. The burnings under Queen Mary did at least have the merit of making the idea revolting to the English conscience.

Nicholas Ridley is a book, as the jacket accurately states, written from a historical rather than a theological point of view. (Incidentally, with less accuracy, it describes Ridley, who remained a celibate, as the ancestor of the author.) The reader may often regret the absence of a closer examination of Ridley's theological opinions; but he will be grateful for what, within its limits, is an excellent biography.

History and theology are both necessary, if the development of the Church of England is to be adequately studied. And since, as we are often rightly told, unity within the Church of England is a primary need of the present day, a study such as the present, objective and accurate, serves to correct many misjudgements, and to deepen one's understanding of the providential preservation of Catholic faith and order through so many troubles of the past.

THE CHURCH ASSEMBLY AND CHURCH RELATIONS

In 1953, the Church Assembly was debating Evangelism; not for the first or the last time. The result of the debate was a motion that a Committee be appointed to consider the proposal for a Central Council for Evangelism, together with other claims on central Church money. The Committee took three years to report, but when it did so, its findings made a substantial book of 86 pages. Evangelism had fallen somewhat into the background, and the question of "other claims on central Church money" had come very much into the foreground; some far-reaching proposals were the result.

Put briefly, the Committee's proposals amount to this: that instead of the variety of Councils and Boards at present associated with the Church Assembly, there should be four main departments, each with a secretary "of outstanding ability and experience, with a commensurate scale of remuneration". These four departments or Councils would deal with activities grouped under the four heads of Education, Social Responsibility, Church Relations, and the Ministry. These Councils could be divided up, if necessary, with separate committees and assistant secretaries, for specific purposes; but the four main Councils would have a controlling authority in these four fields.

Our concern here is only with the proposed Council for Church Relations. Up to the present time, the Church of England had had a number of Councils operating in different connections, which the Report on Central Church Funds would bring to an end. These are the Council for Ecumenical Co-operation, the Overseas Council, and the Council for Commonwealth and Empire Settlement. In their place, according to these proposals, there would be one Council with two main divisions, responsible for missionary work and relations within the Anglican Communion on the one hand, and "ecumenical work and relations with other constituent churches of the World and British Councils of Churches" on the other. The Council for Foreign Relations is regarded as acting "on behalf of the Archbishop in many matters which affect the relations of the Church of England with foreign churches". These, although the Report does not make the point, are not necessarily members of the World Council of Churches, for the Council has within its purview matters relating to the Roman Catholic and to the Eastern Orthodox Communion.

For this particular work, which it is proposed to leave outside the general scheme, the Report suggests an annual vote of not more than £3,000 to the Archbishop of Canterbury, so that he may employ such staff as is needed. It is not clear from the Report how any further money necessary would be raised, although it is pointed out that the present cost of the Foreign Relations Council is well over £5,000.

What then would be the terms of reference of the new Council? The Council, we are told, would be responsible for providing a link between "the Church of England, the Anglican Communion, and the churches of the World and British Councils of Churches", and for the stimulation of a sense of corporate responsibility in the Church of England "for the work of the Church overseas and for the ecumenical movement". It would consist of twenty-six members, appointed in various ways.

The whole Report received a mixed reception at the Church Assembly. Further debate on it has however been postponed

until June, and in the meantime many modifications have been suggested. The Overseas Council has put on record its conviction that the main functions of itself and of the Council for Ecumenical Co-operation are quite distinct, and that no one Council could profitably deal with them both. The latter of these two Councils sees the immediate prospect as being no more than that of having "a common policy making executive for the two divisions". It points out that with time the number of meetings of the Main Council "is likely to increase", and that the number of meetings of the subsidiary bodies "should correspondingly diminish". There is some caution in that word "should". It is fatally easy for the number of meetings of all sorts of committees to increase, and very difficult for the number to be diminished. Unless the proposed new Council replaces some of the existing machinery, it will only lead to an unnecessary and frustrating waste of time and money.

It is impossible to say what will happen in June, when the debate on the Report is continued. The probability is that the general plan for reorganisation will be adopted, at least by easy stages. It is indeed difficult for those members of the Church, and of the Church Assembly, who have not had the same opportunities as the members of the reporting Committee to study the detailed implications of these proposals, to deny their value. But there will be a widespread feeling that the dangers of bureaucracy and centralisation are uncomfortably close. It will be desirable to test out the general plan in particular ways, for a plan that looks excellent on paper may not be ideal in practice; and plans that look unworkable on paper sometimes have the virtue of turning out well in practice.

One very desirable thing remains; whatever the Church of England does in the sphere of "ecumenical relations" will be reported back to the Church Assembly, and be subject matter for debate and questioning. That is the one way in which it is possible to ensure confidence in what is being done.

Communications for the Editor and Annual Subscriptions to *Faith and Unity*, which may begin at any time (minimum subscription, post free, four shillings a year), should be sent to the Secretary, C.D.C.P., 6 Hyde Park Gate, London, S.W.7.